

**REMARKS**

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 5 and 6 are amended. No new matter is added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is amended for greater clarification to recite manufacturing a lens, and etching a surface of the manufactured lens to reduce the optical thickness when the optical thickness of the manufactured lens is greater than a target optical thickness. Applicant respectfully submit that the claims are not narrowed by such amendments as the subject matter recited is only restated and made more explicit.

Applicant thanks Examiners Hasan and Sugarman for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representatives during the November 9 personal interview. During the interview, the Examiners agreed that Morris does not teach or suggest the method of the amended claims.

The Office Action rejects claims 5, 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) U.S. Patent No. 6,075,650 to Morris et al. (Morris). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 recites etching a surface of the manufactured lens to reduce the optical thickness.

As discussed during the interview, Morris teaches at col. 9, lines 16-22 that the photo-polymer is developed to obtain a desired surface-relief profile. The photo-polymer may be used as a lens surface, or the photo-polymer may be etched such that a desired surface-relief profile is formed in the underlying substrate to make a lens surface from the substrate. In other words, Morris teaches that the photo-polymer may be 1) a lens surface or 2) used for etching. Morris does not disclose that a lens surface that has been formed is etched.

As discussed and agreed during the interview, Morris does not teach or suggest etching a surface of the manufactured lens to reduce the optical thickness, as recited in claim 5.

As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 5 is patentable over Morris.

Claims 8 and 11 are patentable at least of their dependence on claim 5, as well as for the additional features they recite.

At least for these reasons, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.


The Office Action rejects claims 6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Morris. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6 and 9 are patentable at least of their dependence on claim 5, as well as for the additional features they recite.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 5, 6, 8, 9 and 11 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino  
Registration No. 33,565

Klifton L. Kime  
Registration No. 42,733

MAC:KXH/tbh

Date: November 10, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461
--